

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/181,601 10/29/98 ANDERSON

S 06137-0021-U

HM12/1031

JANE MASSEY LICATA, ESQ.  
LAW OFFICES OF JANE MASSEY LICATA  
66 E. MAIN STREET  
MARLTON NJ 08053

EXAMINER

FREDMAN, J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1655

15

DATE MAILED:

10/31/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

<b>Advisory Action</b>	Application No. <b>09/181,601</b>	Applicant(s) <b>Anderson et al</b>
	Examiner <b>Jeffrey Fredman</b>	Group Art Unit <b>1655</b>

**THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)]**

- a)  expires three months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b)  expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

- Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on \_\_\_\_\_ (or within any period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).

**Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed on Oct 24, 2000 has been considered with the following effect, but is NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:**

The proposed amendment(s):

- will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.
- will not be entered because:
  - they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).
  - they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).
  - they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
  - they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):  
\_\_\_\_\_

- Newly proposed or amended claims \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.

- The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
see attached sheet.

- The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

- For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):

Claims allowed: None

Claims objected to: None

Claims rejected: 1-17

- The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ has  has not been approved by the Examiner.
- Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- Other

  
**JEFFREY FREDMAN**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
**ART UNIT 1655**

*Response to Arguments*

1. The amendment will be entered, as it does not overcome the current Wallace reference as discussed below.
2. Applicant's arguments filed October 24, 2000, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Wallace does not teach a method wherein domains of 50-300 amino acids are identified. This argument is not persuasive in view of Wallace's characterization of the Ser195-His57-Asp102 catalytic triad domain (page 1004, column 1), in which Wallace shows a three dimensional putative polypeptide domain which is composed of at least 195 amino acids (Ser195 being included), which falls within the 50-300 amino acids indicated in the claimed range.

Applicant's remaining arguments are based upon the lack of teaching of Wallace, and are therefore not persuasive.